

**COMMON
MARKET
SUICIDE**

by

A. K. CHESTERTON

*Published by Candour Publishing Co.,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.*

*Printed by The Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.,
113 West Street, Farnham, Surrey.*

© COPYRIGHT 1971 A. K. CHESTERTON

I S B N : 85172 817 0

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
I High Treason	5
II Champagne or the Rope	10
III Hell-Bent for the Dark	17
IV U.S. Bulldozing Britain into Europe	28

INTRODUCTION

THIS booklet contains leading articles by the late A. K. Chesterton which appeared between June and September, 1971 in **Candour**—the periodical he founded in 1953 to combat the subversive forces undermining the integrity and unity of the British peoples.

They are reprinted without alteration. Together they stand as a monument to his astonishing prescience, uncompromising patriotism and brilliance as a writer and political critic.

Much ground has been lost in the intervening years; so much of what he foresaw has come to pass. Already, membership of the E.E.C. has entailed drastic alterations in our pattern of trade, making the re-creation of a British world system immeasurably more difficult.

Yet there is still time to build a resistance movement strong enough to put Britain on its feet again as a sovereign nation with its own great and distinctive part to play in the shaping of the future.

The need and the hour alike are critical. Let us act now.

March 1977

Rosine de Bounevalle

HIGH TREASON

THERE was a time, and this not long ago, when a conspiracy to commit high treason — which still carries the death penalty in Britain — used secret signs and passwords, took shape in underground cellars and pursued its nefarious aims deeply hidden from the public gaze: it was an evil emanation of the night. Today, what a difference!

Today not only does treason walk the street in the full light of day, not only does it proclaim its purpose from the house-tops — it commands the air, dominates the newspapers, usurps the pulpits and has as its chief declared protagonist the British Government, whose leader does not hesitate to risk his immortal soul by telling an outrageous lie in furtherance of its objective.

I refer to the most damnable plot to surrender the historic national independence of Great Britain to a cabal set up by the European Economic Community, not answerable to any elected body and most palpably the brain-child of the Lords of International Finance. The lie which I ascribe to the Right Honourable (sic) Edward Heath is his almost unbelievable assurances to the House of Commons that Britain's membership of the E.E.C. does not entail "an erosion of essential national sovereignty."

This preposterous statement, loudly cheered by the mindless Tory back-benchers, was not challenged by the Opposition, which preferred to mark-time and talk about the need to secure the right terms for entry. The parrot-cry of "right terms" has been used by both Conservatives and Labour for the last decade to suggest that the terms have still to be negotiated, whereas in truth they were laid down years ago — in the Treaty of Rome.

If Members of Parliament are not aware of the provisions of that Treaty, then they are irresponsible

ignoramus not fit to be entrusted with the affairs of a Parish Council, while for those who are aware of them some harsher description must be found. The only one which seems to me adequate is that they are conscious traitors.

They must know that immediately Great Britain signs the Treaty of Rome she relinquishes all power to manage her own economic affairs and must allow the goods of her European partners to enter the country duty free while those from her faithful daughter nations overseas are obliged to jump a tariff wall. Nobody is better aware of this fact than Edward Heath, who in his speech at Harvard in March 1967, said that "a new range of subjects which are the essence of politics, for example the form of taxation or the level of social security, will have to be added to those taken by the Community as a whole," which — as the Anti-Common Market League rightly points out — means that "in plain English, all important economic decisions will be made in Brussels, not Westminster." Nor, as Heath also knows, will it be the making of economic decisions alone which are taken out of our hands. Every enactment of the bureaucratic cabal in Brussels will immediately have the force of law in Britain and this covers pretty well the entire range of public affairs. Bureaucrats, being paid, will not be the real masters empowered to order our lives. Their masters will be the Overlords of Monopoly Capitalism, who have long been planning the overthrow of the nation state.

A sidelight on the situation is perhaps to be glimpsed in two utterances by Harold Lever, M.P., the leader of the Labour Party's pro-Common Market task force. Mr. Lever last month went on record proclaiming that Britain's membership of the Common Market was "essential not only for her future prosperity, and no less for her safety." His second statement was quoted in the May **Candour**

and read: "The basic solution (of the currency problem) lies in the creation of a world reserve bank which would create an internationally-accepted reserve unit to replace both dollars and sterling." For those who have minds to comprehend, these two statements taken in conjunction make clear the direction of the international policy drive. Not that Lever himself necessarily knows anything about that!

* * * *

However, it is worth taking a look at the "safety" aspects of the E.E.C. Western Germany has had to cope with a fantastically large number of senior service officers suborned to spy for the Russians. So, to only a slightly less extent, has Italy. France is not unfamiliar with the problem. We have had our "Blakes," our "Lonsdales," our "Fuchs" and various other "guests." Is it not certain that the European Community, with its larger milieu, would be a Devil-inspired **Tom Tiddler's Ground** for espionage agents and saboteurs of every sort and condition? Would treason not permeate every nook and cranny? Is it conceivable that after three or four years we would be left with a single military or technological secret to call our own?

Furthermore, were the manufacture of our arms components to be distributed in accordance with internationalist planning, with parts of our fighters or bombers or missiles being made in Germany, France, Italy, Belgium or elsewhere on the Continent, what a rich harvest would be gathered in by the first tidal wave of a Soviet advance! There would be no Battle of Britain then, and for the simple reason that the pass had previously been sold by Edward Heath under cover of a flaming lie that no surrender of substantial sovereignty was involved. When Churchill wished to commit our fighter squadrons to the Battle of France Dowding, at a grave cost to his own career, was able to restrain him. Submerged in the

European Economic Community we should have no such choice — the decision would lie in the hands of the Communist-orientated directors of international financial policy.

Even so, vitally important though our defence problem undoubtedly is, important though the position of sterling, the marketing of New Zealand produce, the need to safeguard Caribbean sugar and other such matters unquestionably are, yet in a very real sense they are of secondary importance when ranged beside the appalling fact that what is contemplated and imminent is nothing less than the suicide of Great Britain and with it the destruction, root and branch, of the entire British world altogether beyond the power of man to rebuild. And this act, I insist, is treason and would still be treason even if the bulk of the British people were to be hoodwinked into acquiescence. There is such a thing as a duty to the British past and an even greater to the British future. The man who would sell — or chuck away — our splendid British nation into the stews of cosmopolitan servitude deserves a noose around his neck.

Although Britain's manhood nominally fought the first war "to save poor little Belgium" (which incidental aim was achieved) in reality, once the struggle began, they were fighting for their own national survival and the survival of the British world across the seas. If in the second world war they were fighting for the sovereign independence of Poland, then such was their failure that VE-Day should have been a day of national mourning. In truth, of course, once the war had been provoked they were again fighting for their own national survival and for that of the British world beyond the seas, and once again triumph crowned their magnificent qualities.

Of what conceivable use was all the blood-letting and all the untold and untellable agony of these two world-

shattering events, for what long-term purpose were the superb qualities of our fighting-men enlisted, if the result in the life-time of many of us was to be the handing of our realm into the clutches of Rothschild Freres, former chief executive and his like by a bunch of political flaneurs, chancers and general light-weights indifferent to the proud traditions of the British race and to all else except keeping step with the beat of the Wall-street drum. Should they have their way, then in the name of decency let them recover whatever may remain of the bodies of John Amery and William Joyce, that they may be buried in Westminster Abbey and be duly canonized as the pioneers who blazed the path into Europe for Edward Heath and his accomplices.

*Inaction means death to
the British future.*

II

CHAMPAGNE OR THE ROPE

AS has been noted before in these pages, the House of Commons seems to exude a vitiating atmosphere that politically emasculates most of its members, turning them into political zombies or mere lobby-fodder, which is much the same thing. One by one throughout the years I have seen Parliamentary White Hopes, champions of the British future, succumb to the contagion and become political eunuchs, cringing at the crack of the Party Whips and obedient servitors of the masters who for the last quarter of a century have been selling a once proud and mighty nation down the River Thames. The effect of the atmosphere on those who achieve Ministerial or Shadow-Ministerial rank is still more disturbing. If it does not actually corrupt them, as sometimes happens, it almost always reveals and highlights the defects of character which cause them to embrace even the most deplorable expedients as though they were immortal principles: indeed, the prominence accorded them only enhances their pitiful inadequacy for the work entrusted to their care.

* * * *

As instances, if Anthony Eden had been content with **his own metier he would have filled with grace and distinction** the Chair of Arabic at one of our great universities: instead, his irrational ambition led him to become a lightweight Foreign Secretary in a very tough world and subsequently the fatuous Prime Minister who brought upon his country the disgrace of its belly-crawl from Suez. Eden the flaneur gave way to Harold Macmillan the dilettante, who would have done less harm had he stayed with the publishing company which bears his name and where his undoubted gifts and self-regard would have found an outlet better suited to his particular talent. Of

the long succession of comic-opera Prime Ministers Douglas Home has the strongest claim upon our indulgence in that for the role of Coco the Clown he is to the manner born. Worse was to come. Harold Wilson had no need to write **Our Years In Power** to convince realists that his stewardship of our national destiny was that of a bouncing Narcissus, a feather-weight who knows no patriotism, whose knowledge of world affairs is at best half-baked, and whose opportunism is so irresponsible that his every statement has to be treated with reserve. After alienating the loyal Rhodesians, his one tawdry "achievement", Wilson was given the boot and we now find ourselves saddled with a very different kind of Prime Minister.

I once described Edward Heath as having all the fire and sparkle of a cold rice pudding and I am of the same opinion still. It was legitimate, however, to suppose, reversing the aphorism, that he would have the qualities of his defects — that he would be found to possess a rough and ready, if not perhaps a very articulate, fondness for the truth. In his private life this is almost certainly the fact. I do not think that as a private citizen he would find it easy to tell lies. But in his political life, conditioned by the toxic atmosphere of the House of Commons and even more by the heady wine of Premiership — what a difference! And for Great Britain how tragic that difference may prove to be!

* * * *

Last month, when Edward Heath declared that adherence to the Common Market would not entail any substantial erosion of Britain's sovereignty, I wasted no time in searching for polite euphemisms but told the man that what he said was a downright lie. Several readers sent that issue of **Candour** to Downing Street and it may be that he read it. Whether that is so or not, Heath has

several times repeated the lie as though repetition by some magic contrivance could turn it into truth.

To find authority for **Candor's** challenge it is not even necessary to refer to The Treaty of Rome, with all its cast-iron provisions. During the negotiations in Brussels and Luxembourg Heath's Super-Politico-Grocer, the man with the wooden smile and podgy insensitive face which by now must induce nausea in all television viewers, had to secure foreign accord about such matters as our coal and steel industries, while agreeing to a 20 per cent decrease in butter imports from New Zealand, our loyal daughter-nation, and to a fixed price based on the average of the past four years in a situation of wild world-wide inflation, to withdraw sterling as an international currency and to phase out almost every other form of control over Britain's economic, fiscal and legal systems. If these things do not betoken the erosion of national sovereignty, what the hell does?

I say once again, with all the emphasis in my power, that Edward Heath lies and that to lie on such an issue, which involves the very existence of our British identity and the cohesion of all that we have helped to build across the seas, is to participate in an act of constructive treason which in a healthier time would have called for the services of the public hangman.

But not the gallows for Edward Heath, rather an eventual peerage of the Realm he seeks to destroy; for Geoffrey Rippon not the noose but the champagne which he guzzled at Luxembourg to celebrate his victory in preparing to do for his country that which no foreign power has succeeded in doing since the year 1066.

* * * *

Where Parliament does not warp character, it still has power to distort it, as with Enoch Powell. Ten years ago,

together with his boss at the Treasury, the now ennobled Peter Thorneycroft, he backed Macmillan's European free trade area scheme which allowed for our adhering economically to the Common Market, while rejecting the provisions of the Treaty of Rome. It is surprising that a man of Powell's altogether remarkable intellect failed to understand that relinquishment of fiscal control inevitably carried with it control over our political future. Only today, when the crazed leadership of the party he supports has accepted the Treaty of Rome with all its implications, has he awakened to the deadly threat to our national survival which confronts us, but perhaps because of the fog permeating the House of Commons he makes the grave mistake of assuming that the British people have experienced a similar awakening. Indeed, he has congratulated them on the instinct for self-preservation which he believes to have led them to take up their anti-Common Market stance. It is true that they do possess this instinct, but it is quite untrue that it has become activated by the intrigues in Paris, Brussels and Luxembourg. Probably not one in fifty has ever heard of the Treaty of Rome and not one in a thousand has read into it the great plot against national sovereignty. Instead, as the public opinion polls reveal, British opponents of the E.E.C. merger base their case on the increase in the cost of living which would follow, which is simply not good enough.

* * * *

That we live in an age of grasping materialism does not need to be stressed, but something infinitely more precious than material values is here involved. As man does not live by bread alone, so do great nations not sustain themselves by balancing the price of a loaf against the promise of an increase in the weekly pay-package. Butter, cheese, sugar, fishing rights, the role of sterling and all such matters are important within their own contexts, but those

contexts can only be seen in perspective when placed beside the transcendental unity created by upwards of a thousand years of common effort embracing both the exhilaration of success and the shared anguish of disaster.

In other words, what is being traded or recklessly flung away is the spirit of the British nation — a spirit tempered by a millennium of historical endeavour. The materialists in the avidity of their lust for the porcine slopes will dismiss this fact as sentimental, but without sentiment, which is the main-spring of all arts and crafts and of the will to excel, life would be reduced to mere biological functioning, a squalid non-experience which would find its only decency in death. Whatever the internal strains and stresses, whatever the contradictions and antagonisms, whatever the justice and the injustice, whatever the high aspiration and the low intent, there has been created the British soul, which binds in "togetherness" Britons the world over and gives them the pride of "belonging" — the only pride that confers true stature. Lacking it, men are fit only for nothingness, or — what is worse — for the purulence of decay.

* * * *

In two world wars the Anzacs, the Canadians, the South Africans, the Rhodesians, the Highland Division, the Guards Division, the men of the grand old county regiments, our superb seamen and victors in the air, did not give their lives by hundreds of thousands on behalf of the price of bread, the amount of the pay packet, ratios of sugar or butter, fishing limits, the role of sterling or any other of the matters now the subject of negotiation. Important though they be, these matters do not inspire men to sacrifice their lives: only the compulsion to safeguard and hand down to posterity the splendour of the British spirit had that vital power. Is it conceivable that in swilling the champagne provided by his Luxembourg hosts

Geoffrey Rippon spared a solitary minute from his orgy of self-congratulation to think upon the warrior dead of the British Empire?

So toxic is the atmosphere of the House of Commons, if any Member were brave enough to voice his opposition to the Common Market on the basis of defending the soul of Britain he would be howled down by the yahoos of all three parties. Yet in truth is this not the only factor? I ask the question not as a romantic but as a realist. To prove me wrong it would be necessary to establish that in my own life-time one million and a half Britons died on the battlefield on behalf of butter, sterling, fishing limits or some prophetic image of Edward Heath's fixed smile.

The way out for M.P.s who might be expected to show concern is to deny, as Heath has done, that the question of sovereignty is at issue. Typical of the simplistic arguments which they use was Sir Tufton Beamish's statement that, the Common Market notwithstanding, France was still France, Germany still Germany, Italy still Italy and so on. The truth of the gallant knight's utterance is incontrovertible, but it loses all force when placed beside the fact that not only is England still England, Scotland still Scotland, Wigan still Wigan and Hampstead Heath still Hampstead Heath but that Czechoslovakia is still Czechoslovakia, Poland still Poland and Hungary still Hungary. That Parliamentarians' puerilities should be accorded the power of throwing a thousand years of history into the discard is appalling beyond the range of words to describe.

Nor does the idea of a plebiscite inspire much greater confidence, in that the people's own money is at the disposal of the Government wherewith to beguile the people and cause them to betray their past and obliterate their future as a self-controlling national organism. The

extent of the risk is revealed by Little Jack Horner Rippon when he appears on television to depict the rich opportunities of the free access of fifty-five million people to a market of two hundred and fifty million people, with never a word about the vulnerability of a market of fifty-five million to the inroads upon their economy which must be made by the free access accorded the mass-produced exports of the two hundred and fifty million. Rippon and Heath are no amateurs in the game of moulding public opinion and they would never stress the benefits of a one-way traffic if they had the least fear that their opponents possessed adequate means of countering that claim by stressing the far greater disadvantages of the adverse balance which must be created by a two-way traffic. It is not in the role of benefactor that Rothschild Freres of Paris have acquired a sky-scraper in the London area, but in the role of hawk.

Bearing in mind these considerations and the fluctuations revealed in opinion polls, it is difficult to place much more reliance through a referendum on the British people than one does on their Parliamentary representatives. If they remain convinced that adherence to the E.E.C. will hit them in their pockets, then no doubt the right decision given for the less worthy reason is preferable to the wrong decision. But it will not for long avail. Unless the British people re-discover their sense of history, their national soul and their identity with their kinsmen overseas, sooner rather than later they will be delivered like trussed fowl to the awaiting financial hawks of cosmopolis.

Should the day of awakening dawn, the laboured smile will be swiped from the face of Edward Heath and the Rippon glass will be empty of champagne.

III

HELL-BENT FOR THE DARK

WHEN the barbarians — accurately to be defined as strangers without the gate — were poised for the final sweep on Rome, their task was facilitated by the activities of the strangers within the gate who had infiltrated the bureaucracy while others served as foreign legionaries beneath the Roman eagle. The imperial city itself had become a cosmopolitan stew wherein treachery and decay established so absolute a masterdom that still untainted citizens, faithful to her high traditions and dedicated to her survival, found that they were not so much fighting her enemies as drawing swords against a purulent disease. Even so, the manner in which Rome fell although in all conscience foul enough, might be thought preferable to the death of Britain as the end product of perhaps the smoothest, the slickest and the most gigantic public relations job that this country has ever known.

* * * *

No blue-print was drawn up for the destruction of Rome. For the destruction of Britain through adherence to the Common Market large sums of public money have been used to publish a Government White Paper which, so far from being a statement of facts, reads like a fraudulent prospectus offering the British people shares in a millennium glittering beyond the boundaries of the most ecstatic opium-induced vision. To put across this quite fantastic confidence trick, Prime Minister Heath has managed to lay aside his podgy, pedestrian image and become animated with a super-charged missionary zeal. Even his very voice has been divorced from its former somnolence and approaches ever nearer to the sugary persuasiveness of soft-sell commercial television: "You'll be **comfortable** in the Common Market. The Common

Market really **works**. The Common Market will make Britain **great** again." So the voices purr on and on and on.

The Heath arguments match the new Heath style. To persuade is his sole intent. One day he affirms that our economic weakness requires that we join the Common Market. The next day, answering a criticism, he asserts that what enables us to join is the sheer strength of our economy. If the truth should happen to get in the way of the new Heath dynamism, so much the worse for the truth. It gets stood on its head. The real measure of the man's obsession, however, is his brazen argument that because of the enormous importance of the decision that has to be taken it would not be reasonable for the Government to allow a free vote in the House of Commons. The fatuous gathering of Conservative yes-men and yes-women who heard him make this statement in the Central Hall, Westminster, greeted it with tumultuous applause, the measure of their mental capacity! If ever there were a vital issue demanding the non-intervention of the Party Whips, it is surely the issue raised by adherence to the Treaty of Rome, a step which by curtailing national sovereignty from the outset and eventually phasing it out to make way for an overriding European authority would be not so much to place our national future at risk as to ensure that there was no national future to be risked. To bring pressure to bear on Members of Parliament demanding that they place Britain in such mortal peril is intolerable — an adventure in political immorality of the wickedest, the most despicable kind.

The reply of Edward Heath and the other Ministers of The Great Decadence is to deny that the Treaty of Rome will cause any substantial erosion of sovereignty. They would have us believe, in other words, that the Treaty does not mean what its provisions explicitly state that it means. To prove that they are men of truth it would be

necessary for the Prime Minister and his colleagues to establish that the Treaty of Rome does not require the free movement of goods and capital across national frontiers, that it does not call for the co-ordination of municipal laws, that the E.E.C. bureaucracy is not free to operate outside the control of national parliaments, that its edicts are not automatically binding on member states, that there is no sharing of usufruct and that Frenchmen, Germans, Italians and the rest will not have as much right to work, residence and ownership in the United Kingdom as native Britons enjoy. Since such proof cannot be adduced, the men who seek to mislead us would seem to have no alternative in logic other than to suggest that the drafting of the Treaty was only a parlour-game to keep the drafters amused. Preposterous though the suggestion be, Heath need only to put it forward for his witless followers to give him loud and prolonged applause.

Into this phantasmagoria comes tumbling Conservatism's most egregious clown, the Lord Chancellor, who dons and doffs and dons again his title of nobility in the course of political job-hunting and whose mastery of legerdemain has led him to bring a touch of comic opera into the Government's otherwise squalid conspiracy of deception. What his quasi-legal thinking on the subject produces is the quaint idea that so far from Britain's abrogating her sovereignty, in fact through adherence to the Treaty of Rome it will be greatly extended. This half-baked idea is derived from her proposed acquisition of a voice in the councils of the European authority. How false is the argument can be shown by a simple analogy. The man who runs his own business is his own master. If he and the owners of six other businesses decide upon a merger to form a single company, he will doubtless be given a seat on a board of seven directors and therefore a share of one-seventh in the policy-making of the new concern.

To pretend that thereby he gains increase of sovereignty is to make a nonsense of words. In that he can be out-voted by six to one he is no longer sovereign. Even should he be given a power of veto, the exercise of a one-man veto must make a nonsense of business. On a multi-national basis, as in the E.E.C., the power of veto is itself limited by the independent powers invested in the bureaucratic cabal in Brussels. Does Lord Hailsham understand the words he uses? Is he a political schizophrenic or can he be written off as a not too scrupulous political humbug?

Hailsham's semantic flounderings are matched by flounderings of Heath in the historical field. Presenting the European Community as a means of keeping the peace, the Prime Minister announced in scholarly tones that the task was to heal the breach in Europe caused twelve hundred years ago. What an era in which to search for peace and comity! The reference, beyond doubt, was to the Holy Roman Empire, and in particular to the times of Charles the Great. That the Emperor deserved his title is not denied, but neither can it be denied that it was earned entirely by his military prowess. When Charles was not fighting the Saxons he was fighting the Slavs, or the Lombards, or the Westphalians or the Bavarians or the Spaniards. His war against the Saxons ran into no less than fourteen campaigns. When there was no war to be waged, there were raids to be repelled or uprisings to be suppressed. Indeed, the whole Charlemagne [opus] was of battle, culminating in the famous defeat at Roncesvalles. Now Edward the Great would inherit the mantle of Charles the Great. It is true that the new pretender does not think in terms of war. It is an even more significant truth that Europe twelve hundred years ago was struggling and sweating through the millennium known as the Dark Ages to which the benighted Edward Heath, in a fine unhistorical frenzy and all unknowingly calls upon us to return.

The somewhat sick humour of the Prime Minister's mediaeval posturing is not present in the rest of his case. Mostly it consists of unrelieved deception. Here is an almost classic example of his use of the **suppressio veri suggestio falsi techniques**. I quote a passage from his Central Hall address:

"It is suggested we should build up the Commonwealth into a highly protected area. But they don't want a common political policy or defence policy or trading policy. Far from building up a Commonwealth preferential area we have seen since 1958 that gradually this preferential area has been eroded. They want to make their own arrangements."

Heath added that what encouraged the Commonwealth countries to find other outlets for their trade were the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, but as the Treaty was concluded at Geneva in 1947 it is permissible to ask him why they should have waited for eleven years before taking advantage of the alleged benefits. The truth, which he shamelessly suppresses, is that throughout this period our daughter nations over and over again made known the great value they placed upon the Imperial preference system. Diefenbaker even won an election on the strength of a promise, subsequently dishonoured to switch 22½ per cent of Canada's trade with the United States to the United Kingdom.

* * * *

What caused these countries after 1958 to seek alternative outlets was not any reliance placed on the General Agreement, but despair induced by the determined attempts of the Macmillan Government to establish a free trade area with Europe, which would provide for Continental goods to enter Britain duty-free while theirs would be obliged to jump a tariff wall. During my

speaking-tour of New Zealand and Australia in 1960 I received first-hand information about Australian trade commissions travelling all over Asia in search of markets against the day when they would encounter barriers at the British ports. The price to be paid, as they knew, would be a heavy one. Markets are not made available without reciprocal benefits and already Japan has not only acquired substantial assets in both countries but begun to exert political pressure on such vital matters as the White Australian policy. Anzacs knew the risks they ran but felt that they had no other option, sensing that sooner or later a British Government would ditch the Imperial Preference system and leave them to sink or swim. Apart from a temporary life-buoy flung to New Zealand, the Rt. Hon. Edward Heath, showing an obsessive zeal and exuberance hitherto unsuspected, is hell-bent upon proving their instinct sound. And lying like a cheap watch in the process.

If those who drew up or approved the White Paper had even the smallest particle of political honour they would have ensured that it did not read like a rose-tinted travel brochure. They would have set down what they believe to be the "pros" on the one side and an objective statement of the "cons" on the other, thereby giving the British public a chance of deciding upon their destiny without benefit of confidence tricksters breathing down their backs to falsify the facts and stampede them with the high-powered propaganda into making an irrevocable act of national slaughter. As they have not done so I will attempt as briefly as possible to act in their default.

(1) The problem of sovereign independence has already been discussed. All that remains under this heading is to ask the Prime Minister how he would answer President Pompidou's unequivocal assertion that if Britain wished to enter the European Community "she must make a complete break with her identity."

(2) Entering Continental Europe can only further the P.E..P.-Chatham House scheme of international industrial and commercial mergers as an essential feature of the drive towards ever-expanding monopoly. The terms of life will be made increasingly difficult, and in the final phase impossible, for the small man and the small company everywhere.

(3) What would be the difference between an economy dominated by giant monopolies and the Soviet economy? Is it not certain that the political implications would become the same for both?

(4) In the meantime it has to be remembered that while the Communist Party in Britain is small, the French and Italian Communist parties are powerful. The free movement of labour across national frontiers must inevitably include the free movement of Communist agitators.

(5) Although most British trade unions are now against entry, once entry is effected trade unionism here will before long seek federation with trade unionism in Europe, thereby multiplying beyond calculation strike action and general industrial unrest. Will they be eased by the more temperate British approach or will the British approach be influenced by Italian amok-runs? The answer to this question should take into account that Italy's rudimentary social welfare services will hold no attraction for British workers, whereas our own highly developed services will attract Italian workers by the hundreds of thousands to come swarming into Britain.

(6) Relative to points 4 and 5, the prospect of British miners or railwaymen or motor-car workers downing tools in sympathy with their counterparts in France or Germany or Holland or Italy or wherever can scarcely be more pleasurable than the prospect of polyglot rabbles rampaging down Whitehall to make political protests or issues remote from our own shores.

(7) Relative to points 4, 5 and 6, it is a moot point as to which would pose the greater threat to society — European Monopoly Capitalism or European Monopoly Trade Unionism.

(8) Leaving present frenzies out of account, even under the most peaceful dispensation the opening up of Britain to all comers must intensify the problems already created by coloured immigration, leading to a further watering down of our native British stock and the inexorable erosion of British values and traditions.

(9) What was heralded as the Great Debate has proved to be a series of endless petty squabbles about possible economic advantages and disadvantages, in the course of which the Government's chief claim has escaped investigation. The claim, as put forward in the White Paper reads:

"In the light of the experience of the Six themselves, and their conviction that the creation of the Community materially contributed to their growth, and of the essential similarity of our economies, the Government are confident that membership of the enlarged Community will lead to much improved efficiency and productivity in British industry, with a higher rate of investment and a faster growth of real wages."

The "essential similarity of our economies" — that is, or should be, the crux of the argument. Great Britain is a heavily over-industrialised country, dependent for her very life upon the importation of foodstuffs and raw materials. Sanity demands that she should co-operate ever more closely with complementary economies able to supply these needs, whereas the Imperial Preference system which guaranteed them is being thrown over-board in favour of the European tie-up. This is not only the gravest general disservice to Britain and her former overseas partners, it

must also — whatever the farming interests may assert — deal a lethal blow to British agriculture. And for this reason. The former system provided preferences to overseas producers but not the right of free entry. Thus protection could be given to home producers, whereas after transitional periods have expired there will be no protection against the duty-free entry of foreign produce not only from the Common Market countries but also from Greece, Turkey, Tunisia, Morocco, Spain and Israel, with whom they have made preferential agreements. That Britain should also undertake to give preferences to these countries while denying them to Australia, Canada and South Africa maketh the heart sick. It has also to be remembered that France retains a large peasant economy against which in free trade conditions British farmers cannot hope to compete, even on the home market.

(10) As the British Government's claim in the economic field is shown to be bogus, so is its alleged political motivation. This, stated briefly, is that the Community will make Europe independent of the so-called Super-Powers, and better able to compete with them for world markets. It is not in the nature of things for nations, whether or not they be "super-powers" to welcome strong competition. Yet the United States has given every encouragement to the creation of the Common Market and used its utmost endeavours to bulldoze great Britain into full Community membership. Indeed, ten years ago the late President Kennedy, reinforcing the stand made by Professor Hallstein, then Secretary-General of the E.E.C., stated that Britain in joining the Common Market would be **required** to accept the provisions of the Treaty of Rome. After the recent Luxembourg conference President Nixon sent telegrams of congratulation to Edward Heath and the heads of the other participating governments. Do such actions suggest pure altruism in American hearts? Or is it not much more probable that Wall Street sees in the

enlarged community, not a cut-throat competitor, but an economic colony which it will dominate and use for its own ends?

(11) Israel Moses Sieff's Political and Economical Planning has joined forces with Chatham House (the British equivalent of the Council of Foreign Relations) to flood the country with pro-Market propaganda. As the policies which these bodies incubated during the 'thirties, 'forties and 'sixties had a strange habit of being incorporated in legislation, it is perhaps highly significant that their latest treatise envisages the extension of the European Economic Community to embrace the Soviet Union and its satellites. Those who study the subterranean conspiracies which shape the pattern of human affairs are aware that international financiers in New York found the money for the Russian revolutions in 1917 and that close liaison has ever since been maintained between the dominant Money Power and the Communist Empire. It was to be foreseen that sooner rather than later there would be launched a campaign to bring the Soviet Union into the whole of Europe as it was brought at Yalta into the European heartlands. The final objective is a One-World tyranny. The Heaths, the Rippons, the Maudlings, the Hoggs and the rest may suppose that they bestride the European stage as statesmen of the highest order, but in truth they are being used as mere puppets by the masters of mankind.

The only hope lies in the full awakening of the British instinct for survival to the menace of what portends. Should they come to their senses in time it will be more than possible for them to prevent what has been mis-called The Great Debate from becoming The Great Debacle. They have but to assert the British will to live a resurgent British life for their declaration to bring a vast new hope to their kinsmen in the far corners of the earth

and from that hope will come a vibrant and life-giving response. To nurture the belief that British communities of nearly a hundred million people, strategically placed around the world and possessing everything needful for their sustenance, cannot shape for themselves a destiny far more splendid than any foreign association can offer is to be guilty of wilful blindness, defeatism — and, often enough, downright treason.

The decision is one for us alone to decide. If we fail to rise to the level of our potentiality, if we allow our petty politicians to lead us into the European wilderness, there will be nothing left for us to say to Britannia other than the lines Iras spoke to her royal mistress:

"Finish, good lady; the bright day is done,
And we are for the dark."

What can I do?

That is what people are asking.

Our answer is to secure the widest possible distribution of this booklet.

**Great Britain must be
saved from suicide.
Act now by making this
booklet known to millions
of patriots who are being mis-led**

IV

U.S. BULLDOZING BRITAIN INTO EUROPE

THE march towards World Government has many approach lines. When one becomes blocked the wide boys of international finance in Wall Street, with their affiliates elsewhere, are quick to find alternative routes. For instance, in the late 'thirties the Atlantic Union scheme to unite the countries on the Atlantic sea-board within a federal structure came to grief because of the isolationist attitude then prevailing in the United States. Far from being disheartened, the internationalist policy-makers next determined to start with the unification of Europe and their first step was most encouraging to them. The coal, steel and iron industries of France and Germany were wedded in accordance with the so-called Schumann Plan — a name which tactfully concealed the fact that it was designed by David Lilienthal, progenitor of the dubious Tennessee Valley project.

* * * *

Sights were then raised for an all-out attempt to secure the political unification of Europe through the Strasbourg movement, but when this venture failed to get off the ground the internationalists placed it in mothballs (if Lord Boothby and Mr. Christopher Hollis will forgive the metaphor) and proceeded at once to seek political federation by hiding their intentions under the economic cover. Thus was born the Common Market and with it the European Economic Community, based on the enactments of the Treaty of Rome. The political motivation was now all too clear. When Harold Macmillan endeavoured to secure Britain's adherence to the Common Market, by-passing its political implications, he was promptly slapped-down by Professor Hallstein, the E.E.C.'s chief functionary, at the same time as President Kennedy stipulated

that Great Britain would only be admitted to the Common Market if she subscribed to the provisions of the Treaty of Rome in their entirety. As Kennedy could not have been speaking in his role of President, in that the United States had no conceivable right to meddle in the affairs of sovereign nations, one is justified in assuming that he spoke as a ventriloquist's dummy manipulated by the Money Power. In fact all the evidence available establishes that the European Common Market is the child of High Finance, and that Britain's entry into the E.E.C. is required as a further step towards the obliteration of nationhood and its replacement by the phased advance to World Government.

These moves are all part of the conspiracy which dominates our century and threatens to destroy all our most dearly prized values. As I have written elsewhere it is more often than not impossible to name the conspirators, the essence of a conspiracy being that it is plotted in secrecy, far from the public gaze. Nor is the naming of them important once one finds that all the highways and by-ways lead inexorably to the same political objective. By their policies shall you know them.

* * * *

There are, however, incidental clues which throw light on the fact of conspiracy. If the principals, such as the late Bernard Baruch, cannot always be tracked down, their agents — having to do much of their work in public — are unable to enjoy the same concealment and it is they who often let the cat out of the bag. Let us look at one or two of them within the context of the stampede to drown Britain's sovereignty in the Common Market cesspool. To possess significance they must have worked in the top echelons of what can most conveniently and accurately be called the Internationalist Bureaucracy, of whom the prototype was the late Adlai Stevenson. Dean

Acheson and George Ball are as representative of the species as any now alive.

One night last month the B.B.C. allowed a full hour on television to an interview with Acheson, who laid on the charm with a trowel. No awkward question was fired at him to disturb the even tenor of the occasion. He was not asked to explain why, after two juries had found Alger Hiss guilty of perjury in denying that he was a Communist agent within the U.S. Government apparatus, he reaffirmed his friendship with the traitor. Nor was mention made of Acheson's strangely gratuitous pronouncement as Secretary of State that Korea lay outside the bounds of the U.S. defence zone — a clear invitation which the North Koreans were swift to accept. No less curious was the fact that the Soviet Union at that time was withholding the light of its presence from the Security Council, so that its power of veto need not be invoked. As in many other matters Wall Street, the State Department and the Kremlin were playing footy-footy under the table in pursuit of an agreed policy.

After about forty-five minutes of the television interview one began to wonder why so much time was being given to the build-up of the Acheson charm and his retailing of light gossip about the great and the not-so-great, the inevitable happened. "Mr. Acheson", said the interviewer, "you have been quoted as saying that Britain has lost an empire and has yet to find a role. Is that still your opinion?" Then the Acheson voice at last became serious and incisive. "No", he replied, "Britain has now found a role — to enter the Common Market and take the lead in Europe". Here was the heart of the matter. Whether or not the former Secretary of State and avowed friend of Alger Hiss was flown across the Atlantic expressly to say his piece I have no means of ascertaining but it is enough to know that the B.B.C. gave him an hour on the air to

recognise the importance attached to the interview.

George W. Ball, former Assistant Secretary of State and, like Acheson a Bilderberger and member of the Council of Foreign Relations, was also brought into the arena to testify to the Wall Street decision at all costs to hurl Great Britain into the European Economic Community. I do not know whether the B.B.C. has yet grabbed Ball for a television interview, but the chance is unlikely to be missed. Meanwhile he was offered by **The Times**, and accepted, an opportunity to set forth his views at length on Britain's entry into the Common Market. Here are his two opening paragraphs:

"We Americans are watching Britain's agony over Europe with far more intensity than our silence would suggest. Though an habitually noisy nation we are being studiously discreet since, sensitive to the charge of outspokenness in the past, we are determined not to create any false issues that might this time impede an affirmative decision. Yet it would be a major error to assume that we regard the matter with indifference; on the contrary this is a time of mixed hope and anxiety when, in the view of thoughtful Americans, the promise of a stable western system is being critically tested".

Well, well, if the intensity of America's interest is what George Ball declares it to be, one can only wonder what would happen if it laid aside its "studious discretion". An ultimatum?

Pains have been taken by the British Government to gloss over the political implications of the Treaty of Rome and put over the "case" for Britain's entry in terms of alleged economic advantage. Ball on the other hand writes that Americans "tend to focus more on the political than on the purely economic implications of the Rome Treaty", which is readily understandable in the light of projected

World Government. But that does not preclude his dwelling on the "purely" (sic) economic advantage to be derived (by the United States!) from our adherence to the Common Market. I have mentioned above the tendency of the internationalist bureaucracy to let the cat out of the bag, and this is precisely what George Ball proceeds to do. I quote again:

"American business knows from its own experience that the Common Market has generated far more trade than it has deflected and taking account of the fact that United States exports to the Six have increased several fold since the Community first came into being they expect a further expansion of economic activity from British entry. Thus dozens of United States companies are waiting only for the final decision before regrouping their European operations under head offices in London—the city that will, as they see it, emerge as not only the financial but the commercial capital of the new and larger Europe".

This, with submission, reveals to the public gaze the entire short term motivation of the conspiracy. Even if London does become the financial and commercial capital of Europe and that is by no means certain, it will function only as an advance base for New York.

Britain's adherence to the Treaty of Rome would offer tremendous advantages to the wolf packs of Wall Street, who—as Ball informs us—are even now lining up in battle array to make the most of their opportunity. When the process is complete the New York Money Power, instead of having to bring pressure to bear on several national governments, will need to apply the carrot and the stick only to a single European authority.

The other aims, although incidental, are not unimportant. Britain will serve as a bridgehead for the American monopolists in Europe, and at the same time Britain's final abandonment of her overseas relations will facilitate the American takeover which has been progressively stepped up ever since the last war. Not, of course, that Ball would commit such trifles to paper, even in so unsophisticated a journal as **The Times**. He prefers flattery to fact, as is made apparent in the two reasons he puts forward for our entry. One is that Britain's "political genius" is needed to make the European institutions work. As there has been no sign of such genius at any time during the present century, which politically—as distinct from militarily—has been one long retreat from greatness, it is clear that George Ball either admires the politics of defeat or simply does not know the score.

The second reason is that Western Germany, "shaking off the inhibitions of her war guilt" is "moving with confidence, though good faith, towards an independent and assertive foreign policy" so that in French eyes "the counterweight of Britain's commanding presence" will prevent the spectre of German predominance from again driving Europe "toward fragmentation and futility". This is truly an amazing argument. Germany is seen by Ball as a continuing menace: therefore, he argues, Britain should enter into partnership with her to redress the balance in the European Community. I do not for one moment accept the Ball view of Germany as a potential enemy, but if one assumed its validity the integration of our economy with that of Germany, the sharing of our military, scientific and industrial secrets, the joint production of projects (such as the partnership with France in building the **Concord**) would be acts of the sheerest lunacy. The man in danger of assassination does not set up house with the would-be assassin and make him privy

to the details of his life; on the contrary, he keeps him at arm's length and sees to his own protection. I am here endeavouring to demolish the specious Ball argument, not advocating the treatment of Germany as a pariah. What I have in mind is George Washington's little known dictum that nothing is more foolish than to expect real favours to be bestowed by one nation on another.

* * * *

George Ball concludes his tendentious article with something very much like a threat. He writes:

"For Britain to reject the brave chance now offered would be regarded in my country as a fatal sign of exhaustion and resignation — one more proof that Europe can never be a serious partner, one more excuse for **Americans** to turn their backs on a continent that seems incapable of organizing itself to meet the requirements of the modern age. I cannot believe that will happen".

Let Mr. Ball be reassured. Even if the instincts of the British people prevail, which at present does not seem probable, as long as there is a European power-mechanism to be operated or a dollar to be made in the European markets there will be no turning of American backs on the continent. This is a grave misfortune, in that Europe has been catastrophically weakened by the pressures brought to bear by New York and Washington on her national governments, most of all upon British governments, to surrender their overseas possessions in return for "aid" and to abort ventures which, if fully developed, could have made them increasingly independent of United States "protection". As examples, consider what happened to the T.S.R.2, Blue Streak and Black Arrow.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the significance of George Wildman Ball. Two partners in his law firm,

which operates under different names in Washington and New York, were intimately involved in the United Nations racket which paved the way for the United States to usurp the authority over the Congo from which Belgium was ousted, and at the time Ball was Under-Secretary of State—a key position of vital importance in determining the Congolese future. It was revealed not long afterwards that the law firm, using yet another name, was listed at the Justice Department of the U.S. as the agent for the Common Market, the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. In writing his article for **The Times**, the former Assistant Secretary of State did not see fit to disclose his interest.

After leaving the State Department it was announced that George Ball was to work in conjunction with S. G. Warburg & Co., the London-based firm of international financiers stemming from the notorious Kuhn, Loeb outfit (it was Sigmund Warburg who planned Wilson's withdrawal from East of Suez—a policy now carried out by Heath under cover of doing precisely the opposite). For some reason still to be discovered the Warburg-Ball **motif** has been played down and Ball is now presented to the world as an international financier in his own right, which seems highly improbable. The likelihood, amounting to a certainty, is that he is a front-man for the entire Wall Street complex.

* * * *

While Acheson and Ball choose—or are chosen—to take the stage in the role of propagandists, Wall Street bankers aspire to speak with a more authoritative voice, as did Mr. Harold Cleveland, president of the First National City Bank, when testifying to a Congressional committee. Here is part of his testimony:

"If Britain baulks, it will be on grounds of narrow economic nationalism and little Englandism on one side of the House of Commons, with a dash of imperial nostalgia thrown in from the other side. The act itself would tend to confirm and strengthen the negative trends in British thinking. An inward-looking passive Britain would be unable to play the role in European economic and political affairs which U.S. interests require Britain to play".

We need waste no time on the "Little Englander" taunt, which happens to be the one levelled by Imperialists against the anti-Imperialists at the turn of the century. What cannot be disregarded is the statement that the United States, in service to its interests, **requires** us to enter Europe to further those interests. Could anything be more clearly stated? Will the several people who have written to tell me that my insistence that we are being pitch-forked into Europe by Wall Street banksterdom amounted to an obsession now make their apologies?

Not, indeed, that all the pressures came from across the Atlantic. Apart from the many American subsidiaries operating in Britain and therefore able to exert pressure from within, there is also a host of British combines, cartels, monopolies and near-monopolies anxious to seize the opportunity of joining their opposite numbers in Europe to make a corner in their own lines of business. The list of subscribers to the Royal Institute of International Affairs (which I have seen) embodies pretty well the whole shooting-match of finance houses, chain-stores and mammoth industrial corporations. Israel Moses Sieff's Political and Economic Planning receives support from much the same sources, and it is therefore no surprise that these two bodies should have come together to churn out pro-Market propaganda. The full-page advertisement in **The Times** signed by leading industrialists was only a pointer to the forces at work.

What, it may be asked, is their motivation? Leaving aside those tied to the Wall Street Money Power, it can only be ascribed to the lust of the monopolists to expand, expand, expand. The more they expand the stronger becomes their grip on national governments and international authorities. The sinister reality was depicted in ecstatic tones by a writer in the **Daily Telegraph**, whose article concluded with these words:

"It is time to recognise that the multinational company, far from being a misfortune, is more in keeping with the needs of the present-day world than the national State. The political counter-point to the multinational company at present is the Common Market and at a later stage a free world economic order with a unified commercial law. The great mistake, as Prof. Harry Johnson has forcefully observed is to 'accept the rights of government to interfere with the operations of the corporation for its own frequently myopic and narrowly partisan purposes'."

All power to the Financial Capitalists!

This is the peril against which I have warned for over thirty years. Never did I think I would live to see it proclaimed as a positive benefit to be welcomed with open arms.

Moreover, to whet the greed of British-based monopolists, the E.E.C. Commission is now drawing up plans for the oil monopolies in the Common Market to merge into one gigantic monopoly which will enjoy special tax concessions. It also proposes to make available more money for the textile industries that they may "concentrate", in other words, establish a textile monopoly. Furthermore, it is to call for larger-scale assistance to the recently formed international merger of atomic power industries in the form of loans to the builders of atomic power stations.

These are some of the stark facts which account for the demoniacal energy with which the Heath-Rippon combination is bulldozing Britain into the Common Market. High (very high!) Finance and Big Business are bringing the most powerful pressures to bear in the devilish cause of destroying the nations of the world and replacing them with a world-embracing empire, with the World Emperor ensconced in Wall Street and ruling with the heads of the great monopolies as his viceroys, princes, dukes and barons. (The Presidents and Prime Ministers are already in the bag!). A tyrannical regime of this kind is the logical outcome of a human society which has allowed materialism to spread like a cancer throughout its very organism. Unless in the very near future we find antibodies to fight against this hideous social disease we shall die and our death will be well merited.

The first step, I submit, is ruthlessly to free ourselves from the clutches of the present cancer which is the New York Money Power. That accomplished, it will be a relatively easy job to deal with the Chatham House-P.E.P. secondaries. Time is not on our side.

FOR MASS DISTRIBUTION—

Single Copies	25p	5 Copies	£1.00
10 „	£1.50	25 „	£3.50
50 „	£6.00	100 „	£10.00

All Post Free

From Candour Publishing Co.,

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.



CANDOUR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

	Per Annum
U.K.	£2.25
Overseas	£2.50 Airmail
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	\$6.50

Forest House,
Liss Forest, Hants. GU33 7DD

if it is the truth

you want

it is

CANDOUR

you need